

CONGRATULATING HARDING UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIAN JEAN WALDROP

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ms. Jean Waldrop, librarian of Harding University, on receiving the Suzanne Spurrier Academic Librarian Award.

This award is given—in memory of Suzanne Spurrier, the former library director at Harding University—each year to the librarian who exemplifies the spirit of outstanding service and is dedicated to the professionalism that we expect from all librarians.

Miss Waldrop has been working at Harding's Brackett Library since 2006 and oversaw several areas of the library before becoming its director. She has served as the secretary for ARKLink, a board member for Amigos, and is currently serving on the White County Regional Library System board and the Searcy Public Library board.

I would like to extend my congratulations to Jean Waldrop on receiving this recognition and wish her much continued success.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

_____ HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 1:30 p.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

_____ IMPEACHMENT HEARINGS FIT A PATH AND A CONTINUUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized here on the floor of the House of Representatives, and to be recognized for 30 minutes here as the week closes out and we head back to our districts for Thanksgiving.

The scenario that has been playing out here now for several weeks in this Congress has been a topic across the news, across the land, and certainly reverberates within the walls of this building and the halls of the outside buildings everywhere around this country.

I speak, of course, of the attempt to impeach our President, President Donald Trump. The circumstances around this week and last week and the previous week are pretty fresh in our minds, but I would like to paint the scenario on how we got to this point and how the effort to impeach Donald Trump has evolved into the hearings that we are seeing now that are taking place before the Select Committee on Intelligence—finally out in the open—and the hearings and the deliberations that I think are likely to take place on

the other side of this Thanksgiving divide.

Madam Speaker, it all fits a path and a continuum, and it is something that one can trace back clear into as far back, I will say, as perhaps the fall of 2015.

Being a Representative from Iowa, I have been involved in the Presidential selection process at the first-in-the-Nation caucus. We did an event on January 24, 2015, that effectively launched the Presidential campaign for the Nation on that day and brought in a dozen candidates that were eventually announced as candidates for President on the Republican side, and a number of other folks who we had speak that day who we thought might enter into the race.

There was a short handful that were invited that didn't come to that event. But because of that, I found myself in the middle of this churning of the nomination process. I saw the policies and the issues that flowed from that debate, and I was in the middle of the debate myself intensively for nearly a year and a half.

At that event that we did in Des Moines at the Hoyt Sherman Place—it is a theater that our future President Donald Trump spoke from the stage that day, as did a good number of others—as we watched this all unfold and they saw that Donald Trump was moving closer and closer to the nomination—we didn't know this at the time, but we know it now—there were powerful forces within the departments of government that were positioning things against whoever the Republican nominee would be, but certainly against Donald Trump as he became the nominee.

We have seen the texts that came forth from Peter Strzok and from Lisa Page that talked about how it could never happen; that Donald Trump could never beat Hillary Clinton. But they had an insurance policy in the event that that outside long shot actually took place.

Madam Speaker, I want people reminded of this because this insurance policy is being executed right now here in the House of Representatives in these impeachment hearings that are being conducted by ADAM SCHIFF, the chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence.

Now, a number of things happened that need to be investigated that were not investigated nearly as deeply as they should have been and that is, for example, the mishandling of classified information on Hillary Clinton's server, her using a private server that she had set up intentionally to avoid the secure server that one would have as a Secretary of State.

The evidence shows that it is very likely, if not already confirmed, that Barack Obama communicated with Hillary Clinton through that server knowingly, and that he had an email address that was exclusive to him, that was certainly known by a number of people

who he communicated with on the off-line off channel, against-the-law effort to communicate outside the bounds of the government secure servers.

That was going on and she, you know, she paid for BleachBit. She hired people to scrub those servers to get rid of the information. There were over 30,000 emails that were the property of the American people in the form of the Federal Government that were destroyed.

We haven't found those, and she has not been held accountable for that. And the mishandling of that information was clear. It was a stark violation of Federal statute. In October of 2015, and again in April of 2016, then-President Barack Obama said: Well, Hillary Clinton would never intend to jeopardize our national security.

And when he spoke those words, he spoke those words into what became later on, effectively, law. Because the law doesn't require that there be any intent. Negligence, gross negligence, is the only requirement.

She was clearly grossly negligent. She certainly intended to circumvent the secure servers that had been set up for that very purpose of protecting the classified information of all of those emails that we got down out of Anthony Weiner's laptop. There was reported to be 650,000. Some of them were classified emails that went up into that laptop of Anthony Weiner.

□ 1400

But she was never taken to account on that. There was an interview of Hillary Clinton that took place July 2, 2016. That interview had in it, by testimony of the then-Attorney General Loretta Lynch, and also James Comey, the director of the FBI, both testified that there were eight agents in that room that questioned Hillary Clinton. They disagreed on how many were from the Department of Justice and how many were from the FBI.

Since the FBI is a division of the Department of Justice, I think that it is probably not as important an issue as this is: That we don't know their names. But I believe they were hand-picked to bring about the result.

The statement that was delivered 3 days later by James Comey on July 5, that 15- to 17-minute long presentation that sounded like an indictment of Hillary Clinton until you got down to the last few sentences of it, was written clear back in May, and it had the words "gross negligence" in it. And they changed those words from "gross negligence," because that matched the statute that would have been a clear violation, to "extreme carelessness" as opposed to "gross negligence."

And then James Comey said Hillary Clinton would never intend to, and you could not prove intent, so no serious prosecutor would prosecute because you couldn't prove that she intended to jeopardize our national security. But the statute doesn't require the intent. It was Barack Obama's words that

plugged intent into the effect of the language in the statute that I believe was clearly violated by Hillary Clinton.

And furthermore, of the eight that were in that room, the number of investigators that questioned Hillary Clinton, and that is a number that is again agreed to by Loretta Lynch and by James Comey, those eight, we don't know who they are.

I asked her under oath who was at the table. She said she didn't know. In fact, that she had never known. And I asked a previous attorney general that question: What are the odds that an attorney general under those circumstances, the highest-level investigation that the Department of Justice could ever conduct—aside from impeachment, by the way—was the investigation of Hillary Clinton's mis-handling of the emails and the classified documents, what are the odds, I asked the former attorney general, that Loretta Lynch wouldn't know who was in that room questioning Hillary Clinton?

That former attorney general didn't want to go on record, so he held his hand up. Zero is what he signaled with his fingers, in that fashion. It looks like an "okay," for the RECORD.

Well, of course, it wasn't okay to get that answer. And I never believed it. I don't believe it today. I believe I was lied to under oath. And when I asked James Comey the same question under oath as well, he gave me a similar answer. He didn't know.

What are the odds James Comey didn't know who was in that room questioning Hillary Clinton?

And then I asked the question of Peter Strzok under oath, and Peter Strzok gave me an honest answer. He said, "I was." Well, we have seen him in most everything that was going on, and in fact, he was on Robert Mueller's investigative team as well until the text between himself and Lisa Page came out, and then there was no choice, he had to be removed from the Mueller team.

Peter Strzok showed up everywhere that these kind of finaglings were going on, and I believe that he was the one that put the team together that questioned Hillary Clinton that brought about a result that he wanted, and not necessarily an objective one.

So I would ask each one of them, I want to see—this is former Attorney General Loretta Lynch and James Comey, Peter Strzok and others, I want to see the videotape of the interview of Hillary Clinton that took place July 2, 2016.

Sorry, there is no videotape.

Then I want to hear the audiotape.

Sorry, there is no audiotape.

Then I want to read the transcripts.

Sorry, there is no transcript.

Well, they actually weren't sorry. We all know that, Madam Speaker. But there is no videotape of that interview, the highest-level interview that one could imagine at the time. There is no audiotape; there is no transcript.

What exists?

And their answer is, there is a 302 report. The 302 report is compiled from the notes of the investigators that were in the room. But we don't know who those investigators were, except for Peter Strzok. He said he was in the room, but he wouldn't tell me who the others were. And so some place out there, there are presumably eight sets of notes.

Madam Speaker, seven other people were there that heard the testimony of Hillary Clinton, and they are all anonymous. And if we had them before this Congress and we were able to ask them questions under oath, I am going to guess that one or more of them are going to tell us the truth about what took place in the room that day.

But nonetheless, they went through that process. James Comey stepped up and delivered a 15- to 17-minute statement to the press and to the public that resulted in no further action on the gross negligence, which is a violation of Federal statute, by Hillary Clinton.

And, therefore, we moved on to the Presidential election. And further, Peter Strzok, Lisa Page—and I am going to suggest many others—set about trying to prevent Donald Trump from becoming President of the United States. And they were pumping information into the press.

We had the Steele dossier. And you know much of this narrative as it unfolded, but once we got to the election, and Donald Trump was elected President of the United States, he is President-elect on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November.

The following Sunday, in the Mandarin Oriental Hotel here in Washington, D.C., the highest level of Democrats in the country converged on that hotel starting Sunday afternoon, led by—according to a Politico article that I checked—led by George Soros, himself, in that hotel. His face is front and center on the article—in fact, several articles that are out there that tell about this gathering.

So the gathering was scheduled to plan how they were going to utilize—and I use that word kind of cautiously, instead of what I would prefer—how they were going to utilize the new Presidency of Hillary Clinton. But, of course, they had to change their plans, Madam Speaker.

So the plans instead were, how do we deny the ability of Donald Trump to govern this country? What shall we do? And out of that conference that was that following Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday morning, those days, they planned how they would resist this President, this duly-elected President under the Constitution of the United States with over 62 million votes cast for him—an electoral victory—over 300 electoral votes, and they planned on how they were going to deny the will of the American people under the Constitution.

And that plan started out with the resistance movement. And almost im-

mediately, you saw protests in the cities across the country. And I know some of those protestors were paid to go protest, Madam Speaker. So the disruption in our society began, the resistance began.

And what about the rest of the planning that likely took place there—and I use that word carefully, too, because a lot of this was never reported and never spoken to, but we know they planned the resistance movement. And you would see demonstrations in the street with big banners that said "resist" or "resistance."

We saw also nearly a million women came to this city that protested the inauguration of Donald Trump, wearing those pink hats. And I wouldn't repeat into the RECORD what they named those hats, Madam Speaker, but I met hundreds of them. I argued with scores of them, as a matter of fact, at a setting over in one part of the city that night.

Many of them were carrying obscene signs, obscene symbols, and they were there to resist the inauguration of the President and let the world know that they rejected President Donald Trump as a duly-elected President of the United States.

And other things took place, I believe, in the Mandarin Oriental Hotel. And I believe that was when they accelerated a strategy to weaponize certain words in our English language and into the political-speak here in the United States.

"Resist" was one of those words that they used, and that connotes that you are a revolutionary group, that you are fighting against an illegitimate government, that word "resist" or "resistance." And it fomented friction within the streets, and it divides Americans, and it accentuated the differences between us.

Instead of coming together after an election, like we want to do and need to do, instead, we are being divided strategically by the hierarchy of the Democratic party in a strategy that was put together in the Mandarin Hotel in this town.

And then as this unfolded, other pieces of the strategy came together, but some of those things that I believe happened inside that hotel were the acceleration of the weaponization of words. And I can think of one that I know the data on from memory, and it was this: White nationalist.

I looked this up in LexisNexis, because the question came up in front of me in kind of an unexpected way. And so we went back in LexisNexis, first, to see if I had ever used those terms. Never, from the year 2000 all the way up until January of this year when the New York Times misquoted me as using it. But it was virtually unused from the year 2000 all the way up until 2016.

And that means 1 to 200 times a year that would show up in print somewhere in a blog, or maybe a scholarly report of some kind or another, the term

white nationalist. We didn't use those terms as Americans. We didn't write about them, we didn't speak them. It was outside the mind of anything that we were paying attention to collectively—1 to 200 times a year.

So the graph is flat from 2000 up to 2016. And 2016, abruptly, it shoots up to 10,000 times a year—virtually unused until 2016, 10,000 times. Many of that was in the latter part of the year, after the meeting in the Mandarin Hotel. And then the following year, 2017, that term white nationalist was used 30,000 times.

And in 2018, it was still used up there at 20,000 times, Madam Speaker. That was one of the words they weaponized. They weaponized Nazi and fascism and white supremacy altogether, and they want to attack Western Civilization itself.

There are other ways to divide America and to pit us against each other, but they were weaponizing terms.

Other things, the insurance policy that I mentioned earlier. Well, what is that insurance policy? It is tying the President up with protests, lock up everything, delay the confirmations, so that he can't put his government in place. You saw that happen in the Senate over and over again, where they did everything they could do to slow down the confirmation of the President's appointees and not let the President have the team that he wanted to run this country, and to slow down the confirmation of judges in our judicial system as well.

All of that was taking place. And that all fits within a strategy and a plan that I believe is rooted in that day, in that Sunday after the election, beginning there, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, after the election of Donald Trump.

Furthermore, the resistance, the weaponization of language, the delay of confirmations, the obstruction of the ability of the President to deploy the people he wants within this government—and meanwhile, then there was a strategy that was implemented, initially, by James Comey, and also Robert Mueller. Both of them interviewed to be the continuing director of the FBI. And James Comey has admitted all of this under oath, and he has told the public this, and, I think, bragged about it. And that is, that when he had his meeting with President Trump, he went out and sat in his car, and he typed up the notes on what he remembered.

He took those notes, by his own admission, to a professor at Columbia University, who is his friend, with directions for that professor to leak that information to the New York Times. By leaking the interpretation that was typed up by James Comey to the New York Times, they strategized that they could trigger a special counsel, especially, and that special counsel needed to be Robert Mueller. They pulled that all off with the cooperation of the second-in-command at the Department of Justice, Rod Rosenstein.

And so as those recommendations unfolded, we had Mueller as special counsel, James Comey was fired by the President—he resisted that, of course. But the Mueller report then, as they dug through that and spent nearly \$30 million, and they had their team of Never Trumpers to put on to investigate. And all the while, they were going to find the smoking gun.

I am going to use the term “the blue dress.” That would be the reasons that they could impeach Donald Trump. They never found it.

□ 1415

For nearly 2 years of the Mueller investigation, Democrats in this town and across the country were just anxiously waiting for: “When does this information come out that we can grab and say gotcha?”

Madam Speaker, when do you investigate a crime without a crime? When you identify the person whom you want to find guilty, and then you scour everything you possibly can to try to come up with something that you can use to declare the man to be guilty enough that you can do what they already wanted to do, which is remove this President from office.

If they can't remove him from office, then they want to render him ineffective so that they can push their agenda down on him. At the very least, they want to wound him in such a way that they can figure out how to beat him in the election.

That is not speculation, Madam Speaker. That is out of the mouth of one of our Members who speaks on impeachment in this House almost every single day, that we have to impeach Donald Trump because we can't beat him in the election.

The will of the people has already been inhibited and diminished because of the actions of this Congress and the actions of a complicit press, and here we sat with that all unfolding through the Mueller report. It finally came out with a big flop.

If you are wondering how this all fits together, Madam Speaker, then think back that there were 4 to 5 weeks of kind of silence after the Mueller report flopped. There were some who tried to resurrect it again to try to find a morsel in it that they could grasp and embellish. They just couldn't get traction because there was nothing there.

After those 4 to 5 weeks, then we end up with the whistleblower, the whistleblower who was not privy to this telephone conversation that took place on July 25, a whistleblower who I believe is a Democrat operative. The associations that are reported to me and many others say that he has been under the wing of, in the employment of, and in cooperation with many of the highest level people who are partisans on the Democratic side.

This whistleblower is kind of interesting. He triggers an impeachment investigation with second-, third-, and fourth-hand information. He has no

eyes-on, hands-on, or ears-on experience or experience of any kind. He writes a second-, third-, and fourth-hand whistleblower report. Actually, he didn't write it. A team of lawyers wrote this. He mailed it to the chair of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence on August 12.

We had ADAM SCHIFF with this whistleblower report in his hands August 12, and nothing happened for weeks because they were still planning their strategy. ADAM SCHIFF said that he doesn't know who the whistleblower is. That is going to turn out to be one of the clearest examples of untruth that one has seen in this Congress. With a straight face, he looks into the camera and says: I don't know who the whistleblower is, and I haven't met with him.

I think it will be corrected eventually in the RECORD.

The whistleblower must come forward. But when he filed that whistleblower report that was written by the lawyers for him, and it is secondhand, thirdhand, fourth-hand, 100 percent hearsay information, when he filed that, it was filed with the inspector general in the intelligence community.

The rules on accepting whistleblower reports require that it be firsthand information, not hearsay information. The inspector general changed the rules to be able to accept second-, third-, and fourth-hand hearsay information as a whistleblower complaint.

How far do you have to go to have to change the rules on the spot in order for that complaint to even be considered?

Now, the whistleblower becomes public in front of everybody for a day or 2 or 3.

Even much of the social media, I believe, is complicit in this effort to get rid of Donald Trump. They take down any information that would identify this whistleblower.

This is like the emperor has no clothes. He is known by thousands of people in this country. I would say tens of thousands of people, even, at a minimum. He is known by, I would say, at least half the Members on the Republican side, and I could speculate on the Democratic side.

Half the Members on this side know who this whistleblower is, but we can't speak his name because now the emperor has no clothes. We are going to act like we don't know who he is.

Somehow, his information is credible enough, even though it is hearsay, that you are putting America through all of this pain, this agony, and this trying to turn over another stone, and maybe there will be something underneath there that we can use to get rid of this President.

They are trying to find the firsthand information that has been missing, so they bring Ambassador Sondland forward. Surely, he would have firsthand information. He testified that he understood that there was a quid pro quo.

It turns out that his understanding was an assumption. It wasn't necessarily an experience, that he had anything that he could point to.

But he testified just yesterday. I thought it was pretty interesting.

The Republican attorney, Steve Castor, asked him this question: "Why don't you tell us, what did the President say to you on September 9 that you remember?"

"What did the President say?" That would be firsthand information, to answer that question.

Ambassador Sondland said: "Well, words to the effect—I decided to ask the President the question in an open-ended fashion because there were so many different scenarios floating around as to what was going on with Ukraine. So rather than ask the President nine different questions: Is it this? Is it this? Is it that?"

He is demonstrating how he might ask nine different questions. He said: "I just said, what do you want from Ukraine?"

This is exactly the quote that will now be in the transcript of his testimony yesterday. He said: "I may have even used a four-letter word." That sounds like an honest statement, then.

Sondland, the Ambassador, testified yesterday that the President's answer to that question, the question of what do you want from Ukraine was this: "I want nothing. I want no quid pro quo. I just want Zelensky to do the right thing, to do what he ran on." Then he finished up: "Or words to that effect."

That makes it pretty clear that the President isn't asking for a quid pro quo.

If there is some kind of suspicion on the part of disloyal bureaucrats who are of an opposite ideology from a duly elected President of the United States, who don't agree with his foreign policy, or who try to undermine his foreign policy and undermine the Presidency itself and the effect of the Presidency itself, that is what happens. They create these scenarios. They say that, surely, he must have wanted a quid pro quo.

This is clear evidence that there was not one. He stated multiple times that he was never told by the President that there were preconditions for the aid to be released. He was never told that there were preconditions.

I thank Congressman MICHAEL TURNER for bringing this out yesterday in such a clear fashion when he asked Ambassador Sondland so directly that question. Then Representative TURNER, to nail this down, said to Ambassador Sondland: "After you testified, Chairman SCHIFF ran out and gave a press conference and said he gets to impeach the President of the United States because of your testimony."

The understanding and the implication was that there was a quid pro quo, is what Representative TURNER is saying.

He continues the question to Sondland: "And if you pull up CNN today, right now, their banner says, 'Sondland ties Trump to withholding aid.' Is that your testimony today, Ambassador Sondland, that you have evi-

dence that Donald Trump tied the investigations to the aid? Because I don't think you are saying that."

Ambassador Sondland's response was: "I have said repeatedly, Congressman, I was presuming. I also said that President Trump," but Turner cut him off and said: "So no one told you, not just the President? Giuliani didn't tell you? Mulvaney didn't tell you? Nobody—Pompeo didn't tell you? Nobody else on this planet told you that Donald Trump was tying aid to these investigations; is that correct?"

Sondland said: "I think I already testified—"

Turner cut him off again and said: "No, answer the question. Is it correct? No one on this planet told you that Donald Trump was tying this aid to the investigations? Because if your answer is yes, then the chairman is wrong, and the headline on CNN is wrong. No one on this planet told you that President Trump was tying aid to investigations, yes or no?"

Ambassador Sondland answered "yes," which means no one told him that there was any quid pro quo. It was all in his head, and America is all tied up in these knots over this kind of secondhand information that is distorted in the minds of the people who delivered it to us.

This must be firsthand information, and it must be factual. America needs to be released from this. There is nothing here again. We are going into the third year of this Presidency, and still, they persist.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate being recognized to address you here. I wish you and everyone a very, very happy Thanksgiving. Let's come back happier than I happen to be today.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LEWIS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1838.—An act to amend the Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, and for other purposes.

S. 2710.—An act to prohibit the commercial export of covered munitions items to the Hong Kong Police Force.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 22, 2019, at 1:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3052. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Modification of Handling Regulations [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-18-0075; SC19-966-1 FR] received November 20, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3053. A letter from the Administrator, National Organic Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Organic Program; Amendments to the National List of Allowed and Prohibited Substances per April 2018 NOSB Recommendations (Crops and Handling) [Document Number: AMS-NOP-18-0051; NOP-18-02] (RIN: 0581 AD80) received November 20, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3054. A letter from the Administrator, Cotton and Tobacco Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Cotton Board Rules and Regulations: Adjusting Supplemental Assessment on Imports (2019 Amendments) [Doc. #: AMS-CN-19-0007] received November 20, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3055. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's interpretive rule — Truth in Lending (Regulation Z); Screening and Training Requirements for Mortgage Loan Originators With Temporary Authority received November 20, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3056. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2019-0003; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8601] received November 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3057. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2019-0003; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8597] received November 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3058. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2019-0003; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8595] received November 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3059. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2019-0003; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8603] received November 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3060. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, Chief Counsel's Office, Office of the